

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the official action dated May 9, 2011. The claim amendments included herein are merely clarifying amendments and are not meant to change the intended scope of the claims. Thus, the amendments present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and they should be entered in due course. Moreover, the amendments are manifest, requiring only a cursory review by the Examiner, thereby providing additional ground for their entry.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 49-63, 87-92, and 94-96 were pending in the application. In the official action, claims 1-5, 7-11, 49-63, 87-92, and 94-96 were rejected. In this amendment claims 1, 11, and 49 have been amended. In addition, claims 94-96 have been renumbered as claims 93-95 to correct for a prior typographical error, and renumbered claim 94 has been amended for purposes of conforming its dependency to the claim renumbering. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 49-63, and 87-95 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7-11, 49-63, and 87-95 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 94-96 were objected to because of informalities. More specifically, claims 94-96 were objected to as being incorrectly numbered.

Applicants have renumbered claims 94-96 as claims 93-95 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. In addition, Applicants have amended renumbered claim 94 so that the claim's dependency conforms to the renumbering. Accordingly, Applicants request that the claim objections be withdrawn.

\$102 and \$103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11, 49-55, 63, 87-92, and 94-96 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Berstis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,653).

Claims 9, 10, and 56-61 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis in view of Downs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,618).

Claim 62 was rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis.

Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11, and 49 are patentable over Berstis and Downs (together "the cited references").

Applicants' invention as recited in claims 1, 11, and 49 is directed toward an apparatus and method for reproducing contents data which includes at least one of audio data and video data. Each of claims recites "right data including an encrypted use period and a key for decrypting the encrypted use period." Supporting disclosure for the quoted recitation can be found in the specification at, for example, page 47, lines 7-26.

Neither of the cited references discloses the quoted recitation. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 1, 11, and 49 are patentable over the cited references - taken either individually or in combination - on at least this basis.

Further, since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, Applicants believe that dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, 50-63, and 87-95 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or

if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: June 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature:

/Bruno Polito/

Bruno Polito

Registration No.: 38,580

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

1413069\_1.doc